



PATENT

Case Docket No. ASMEEX.137C1
Date: September 30, 2002

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s) : Raaijmakers
Appl. No. : 09/584,656
Filed : May 30, 2000
For : APPARATUS FOR THERMAL
TREATMENT OF
SUBSTRATES
Examiner : Leonard R. Leo
Group Art Unit : 3743

I hereby certify that this correspondence and all marked
attachments are being deposited with the United States
Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope
addressed to: United States Patent and Trademark
Office, P.O. Box 2327, Arlington, VA 22202, on

September 30, 2002

(Date)

Adeel S. Akhtar, Reg. No. 41,394

RECEIVED

OCT 10 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 2327
Arlington, VA 22202

Dear Sir:

Enclosed for filing in the above-identified application are:

- (X) A Request for Reconsideration in 5 pages.
- (X) The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Account No. 11-1410.
- (X) Return prepaid postcard.

Adeel S. Akhtar
Registration No. 41,394
Attorney of Record



PATENT

LD
10-11-02
121 #12

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Raaijmakers

) Group Art Unit 3743

Appl. No. : 09/584,656

Filed : May 30, 2000

For : APPARATUS FOR THERMAL
TREATMENT OF
SUBSTRATES

Examiner : Leonard R. Leo

) I hereby certify that this correspondence and all
) marked attachments are being deposited with
) the United States Postal Service as first-class
) mail in an envelope addressed to: United States
) Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 2327,
) Arlington, VA 22202, on

) September 30, 2002

) (Date)

) *Adeel S. Akhtar*
) Adeel S. Akhtar, Reg. No. 41,394REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

RECEIVED

OCT 1 0 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 2327
Arlington, VA 22202

Dear Sir:

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on July 30, 2002, please reconsider the above-captioned application in view of the following remarks:

REMARKS

The Examiner has continued to reject all of the pending claims as being anticipated or under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) or obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

All of the Examiner's rejections are based upon the Examiner's refusal to give patentable weight to functional language related to "high temperature treatment of substrates," "allowing treatment of the substrate upon the support structure" and "configured to support a substrate in a process chamber during high temperature processing." If the Examiner were to give due weight to this language, then the rejections cannot stand.

Applicant traverses the rejections and submits that they are based upon legally incorrect findings that the claim language cannot be given any patentable weight. The Examiner seems confused between giving weight to functional language as a method or step limitation, and draws